

External evaluation terms of reference (ToR)

Our Rights, Our Future!

Date: August 2026



Purpose	To procure an external consultancy to conduct the Mid-Term and Final Evaluations of the “Our Rights, Our Future!” project and provide independent assessment, learning, and recommendations for accountability and programme improvement.
Intended use	The evaluation findings will be used by ForumCiv, COSPE, CCPR, project partners, and the European Commission to assess performance, accountability, learning, strategic adaptation, and sustainability of the project.
Contracting organisation	ForumCiv (Lead Applicant of the Consortium)
Donor	European Union – DG INTPA
Time period evaluated	01/01/2025 – 31/12/2027
Duration of evaluation	60-120 days per evaluation phase
Expected start date	Mid-Term Evaluation: Q3-Q4 2026; Final Evaluation: Q4 2027

1. BACKGROUND

Our Rights, Our Future! (OROF) is a 36-month global action implemented from January 2025 to December 2027 by a consortium composed of ForumCiv, COSPE – Cooperazione per lo Sviluppo dei Paesi Emergenti and CCPR – Centre for Civil and Political Rights, with financial support from the European Union under the Thematic Framework Partnerships for Human Rights and Democracy programme.

The action aims to strengthen the capacities and opportunities of civil society actors — particularly youth-led and youth-focused organisations representing marginalised and discriminated groups — to participate safely and effectively in civic and political spaces and defend the rights to freedom of association and peaceful assembly.

The project operates across four regions: Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, Middle East and North Africa (MENA), and South-East Asia, with targeted implementation in nine countries: Brazil, Colombia, Kenya, Senegal, Eswatini, Tunisia, Palestine, Indonesia and Sri Lanka.

The project responds to the global shrinking of civic spaces, increasing authoritarianism, criminalisation of activists, restrictions on freedoms of association and assembly, digital surveillance, misinformation and structural discrimination affecting youth, women, LGBTQIA+ persons, indigenous peoples, Afro-descendants, ethnic and religious minorities, and other marginalised groups.

The project strategy is organised around three interconnected pillars:

1. **Capacity building and organisational strengthening** of CSOs, CBOs and informal groups;
2. **Protection, monitoring and documentation** of violations related to civic freedoms and human rights;
3. **Advocacy, networking and engagement** with national, regional and international human rights mechanisms.

The structure of the intervention and its corresponding indicators are as follows:

	Logical Framework	Indicators	Target (value & reference year)
Impact (Overall objective)	Impact: Rights holders, particularly marginalised youth, are more able to actively, safely and meaningfully participate in the civic space as drivers of change to promote and defend fundamental freedoms, democracy and human rights at local and global levels.	Impact indicator 1: Country' score according to the CIVICUS Monitor in relation to quality of civic space	Target for impact indicator 1: = or > country scores by the end of the project
		Impact indicator 2: Proportion of young people (18-29 years) who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive, by country, sex, age, and relevant population group.	Target for impact indicator 2: Increased % by the end of the project in each country
Outcome (Specific Objective)	Outcome 1: Youth-led or youth-focused movements, CBOs and CSOs are able to promote an enabling environment and transformative actions to exercise and protect the right to peaceful assembly and association, especially for marginalised and discriminated groups, in targeted countries of four key regions of the Global South (South East Asia, Africa, MENA, Latin America)	1.1 – Indicator 1 to Outcome 1 Number of people reached through initiatives, campaigns, events, meeting on fundamental rights, freedom of association, assembly and expression, disaggregated by country and region and type of initiative (and sex, age wherever possible) promoted by youth led or youth focused CSOs/CBOs/networks targeted by the Action	Indicator 1.1: To be quantified by first months of the project according to Communication and Visibility Plan and mapping of CSOs at national, regional and global level (A.1.1.1)
		1.2 – Indicator 2 to Outcome 1 Number of reports/submissions presented by youth-led or youth focused networks targeted by the Action to regional and international human rights bodies, disaggregated by topic, international body.	1.2 – Target for Indicator 1.2: + 9 (1 for each target country) by the end of the project
		1.3 – Indicator 3 to Outcome 1 Number of local/national/regional/global programmes, policies, budgets, instruments developed or revised with participation of targeted youth-led or youth-focused civil society networks, disaggregated by type, topic, institutional level.	1.3 – Target for Indicator 1.3: At least + 10 by the end of the project
Outputs	1.1 Output 1 related to Outcome 1 Op. 1.1 - CSOs and CBOs and informal groups increase their capacities to represent and express the collective interests of their community members, constituencies, and target groups	1.1.1 Indicator 1 to Output 1 Number of CSOs/CBOs/informal groups members trained with increased knowledge and/or skills on leadership skills; governance standards, transparency and accountability; and operational and institutional management, disaggregated by sex, age, country, type of organisation	1.1.1 Target for Indicator 1.1.1: 600

	1.2 Output 2 related to Outcome 1 Op. 1.2 - Activists and their networks increase access to tools and protection for collective visibility and advocacy on violations of the right to assembly and association	1.1.2 Indicator 2 to Output 1 Number of targeted activists involved in knowledge production and best practices sharing and dissemination at regional and global level, disaggregated by SOGIE, age, country/region and typology of	1.1.2 Target for Indicator 1.1.2:200
		1.2.1. Indicator 1 to Output 2 Number of activists at risk /victims of human rights violations benefiting from assistance by CBOs/CSOs/informal groups targeted by the Action, disaggregated by SOGIE, age, type of violation, type of assistance.	1.2.1. Target for Indicator 1.2.1: + 150
		1.2.2 Indicator 2 to Output 2 Number of tools/infrastructures developed by Consortium partner and CSOs targeted by the Action for the protection of human rights and activists' risk mitigation , disaggregated by type of tool/infrastructure.	1.2.2 Target for Indicator 1.2.2: 9
	1.3 Output 3 related to Outcome 1 Op. 1.3 - Civil society networks increase public and civic spaces and alliances to promote and protect the right to peaceful assembly and association	1.3.1 Indicator 1 to Output 3 Number of activists targeted by the Action that participate significantly in national, regional and international (a) decision-making bodies, (b) human rights dialogues mechanisms and bodies, disaggregated by SOGIE, age, country	1.3.1 Target for Indicator 1.3.1: 600
		1.3.2 Indicator 2 to Output 3 Number of global, regional and national collective advocacy strategies designed and implemented by targeted civil society.	1.3.2 Target for Indicator 1.3.2: 15

The consortium applies a human rights-based, intersectional, gender-transformative and participatory approach throughout the implementation of the action.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE, AUDIENCE AND SCOPE

2.1 Description of the assignment

The consultancy will conduct (1) one **Mid-Term Evaluation** (formative evaluation) and (2) one **Final Evaluation** (summative evaluation). The methodology shall be participatory to stimulate engagement among participants.

The evaluations aim to:

- assess the relevance (the activity responds to need and priorities), effectiveness (satisfaction on methodology, logistics, technical expertise of trainers/facilitators/consultants), efficiency, coherence, impact and sustainability of the project;
- identify lessons learned, challenges and good practices;
- provide practical recommendations to improve implementation and future programming;
- support accountability toward the European Union and consortium stakeholders.

The Mid-Term Evaluation, covering the implementation period between January 2025 – June 2026, will focus on learning, adaptive management and strategic improvement during implementation, while the Final Evaluation, covering the entire three-year implementation period, will focus on overall achievements, outcomes, sustainability, impact and lessons learned.

This procurement process concerns the Mid-Term Evaluation of the OROF project. Tenderers are also requested to submit an indicative technical and financial proposal for the Final Evaluation. However, any continuation of services for the Final Evaluation will be subject to satisfactory performance, continued need, available budget, applicable procurement rules and a separate written confirmation or contract amendment by ForumCiv.

2.2 Target audiences

The primary target audiences are:

- European Commission (DG INTPA)
- ForumCiv
- COSPE
- CCPR
- Project management and country teams

The secondary target audiences are:

- Participating CSOs/CBOs/networks
- Human rights stakeholders and partners
- Donors and allied organisations
- Civil society networks and advocacy actors

2.3 Geographical and Thematic Scope

The evaluations must address the global, national and regional dimensions of the project, including activities and stakeholders in all four regions, with specific attention also to the nine target countries. Target groups must consider the diversity of participants, including:

- youth-led and youth-focused organisations;
- women and feminist organisations;
- LGBTQIA+ groups;
- indigenous and Afro-descendant youth;
- ethnic and religious minorities;
- human rights defenders;
- informal civic movements and grassroots groups;
- other stakeholders' representatives reached by the project (UN bodies, national and local institutions, EU Delegations, and other institutions).

Regarding thematic focus, the evaluations shall assess mainly, but not exclusively:

- capacity-building processes;
- organisational strengthening;

- protection mechanisms;
- advocacy and civic participation;
- monitoring/documentation systems;
- sub-granting/FSTP mechanisms;
- networking and coalition-building;
- communication and visibility actions;
- project management, governance and coordination systems.

3. ADOPTION OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS

ForumCiv follows the Istanbul principles for CSO development effectiveness and OECD/DAC standards to judge the quality and performance of development programmes. The evaluation must answer to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria which include relevance and coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability¹.

The evaluations must therefore apply the OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria (Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability), integrate a human rights-based approach, apply gender-sensitive and intersectional methodologies, ensure ethical and participatory evaluation standards, and respect confidentiality and protection of participants, particularly human rights defenders and vulnerable groups.

4. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, QUESTIONS AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The evaluation of the “Our Rights, Our Future!” (OROF) project shall assess the extent to which the intervention contributes to strengthening the capacities, protection, visibility and participation of youth-led and youth-focused civil society actors defending the rights to freedom of association and peaceful assembly in restrictive civic environments.

The evaluations will adopt the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria — relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability — and integrate a human rights-based, gender-transformative, intersectional and participatory approach throughout the evaluation process.

The evaluators are expected to examine the project as a whole, including:

- global, regional and country-level implementation;
- governance and coordination mechanisms;
- capacity building and organisational strengthening;
- financial support to third parties (FSTP);
- protection and security mechanisms;
- monitoring and documentation systems;
- advocacy and engagement with UN and international mechanisms;
- communication and visibility strategies;
- learning, networking and movement-building dimensions.

The evaluations must consider the project’s implementation across the four targeted regions (Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, MENA and South-East Asia) and the nine target countries: Brazil, Colombia, Kenya, Senegal, Eswatini, Tunisia, Palestine, Indonesia and Sri Lanka.

4.1 Evaluation Objectives

¹ [Quality Standards for Development Evaluation \(EN\)](#)

A. Relevance and Strategic Coherence: to assess the continued relevance of the OROF project objectives, intervention logic, methodologies and implementation strategies in relation to:

- the evolving political, social and civic contexts in target countries and regions;
- the needs and priorities of youth-led and youth-focused CSOs, CBOs, informal groups and networks;
- the realities faced by marginalised and discriminated groups, particularly women, LGBTQIA+ youth, indigenous peoples, Afro-descendants, ethnic and religious minorities, rural youth and human rights defenders;
- EU priorities on human rights, civic participation and democratic governance;
- Theory of Change of the project, Rights-Based Approach and other approaches.

The evaluation shall examine whether the project design appropriately responds to shrinking civic spaces, criminalisation of activism, restrictions on peaceful assembly and association, digital surveillance, disinformation and other contextual risks identified during implementation.

The evaluators shall also assess the coherence between:

- the three strategic pillars of the project:
 - capacity strengthening,
 - protection and monitoring,
 - advocacy and civic engagement;
- the project logical framework and implementation modalities;
- regional and country-level implementation strategies;
- the coordination roles of ForumCiv, COSPE and CCPR within the consortium structure.
- **B. Effectiveness:** to assess the extent to which the project has achieved, or is likely to achieve, its intended outputs, outcomes and objectives, including strengthening organisational, operational and management capacities of CSOs, CBOs and informal groups;
- improving access to tools, knowledge, protection mechanisms and resources for civic participation;
- reinforcing monitoring, documentation and reporting on violations of freedom of association and peaceful assembly;
- strengthening engagement of civil society with UN and international human rights mechanisms;
- supporting advocacy, coalition-building and civic mobilisation;
- increasing visibility, participation and leadership of youth and marginalised groups in civic spaces.

The evaluations shall specifically assess the effectiveness of:

- the Transformative Capacity Building Programme;
- the e-learning platform and blended learning methodologies;
- mentoring and tutoring approaches;
- participatory and decentralised sub-granting mechanisms (FSTP);
- country and risk analyses;
- protection and security systems for activists;
- regional and global exchanges, study visits and bootcamps;
- communication, visibility and storytelling strategies;
- engagement with media, networks and advocacy actors.

The evaluations shall analyse enabling and limiting factors affecting implementation, including:

- political and security conditions;
- digital risks and surveillance;
- organisational capacities of local actors;
- language and accessibility barriers;
- internal consortium coordination;
- adaptability of implementation mechanisms.

C. Efficiency: to assess the efficiency and quality of project implementation, management and resource utilisation, including:

- governance and coordination mechanisms at global, regional and country levels;
- financial and administrative management systems;
- communication and information-sharing mechanisms;
- planning, monitoring and reporting systems;
- use of human, financial and technical resources;
- procurement and sub-grant management processes;
- timeliness and adaptability of implementation.

The evaluations shall examine the extent to which the project management structure and operational arrangements contributed to effective delivery of activities and achievement of results.

Particular attention should be paid to:

- the effectiveness of the Steering Committee and PMU mechanisms;
- coordination among consortium members;
- regional-country coordination flows;
- monitoring and MEAL systems;
- efficiency and accessibility of the FSTP mechanisms;
- cost-effectiveness of capacity-building and networking activities;
- appropriateness of the online learning infrastructure and multilingual approach.

D. Impact: to assess the intended and unintended, positive and negative, direct and indirect effects generated by the project on:

- youth activists and human rights defenders;
- participating CSOs/CBOs and informal groups;
- networks, coalitions and civic movements;
- civic participation and democratic engagement;
- protection and visibility of civic freedoms;
- advocacy and policy influence processes.

The evaluations shall assess the extent to which the project has contributed to:

- strengthening agency and leadership of marginalised youth;
- increasing participation of women and discriminated groups in civic spaces;
- reinforcing collective mobilisation and movement-building;
- improving protection and resilience capacities of activists and organisations;
- expanding civic awareness and public visibility on freedoms of assembly and association;

- facilitating stronger engagement with human rights mechanisms and international advocacy spaces;
- promoting intersectional and rights-based approaches within civic activism.

The evaluations shall also identify:

- transformational changes at individual, organisational and network levels;
- multiplier effects and dissemination of knowledge and methodologies;
- unexpected or emerging outcomes;
- changes in attitudes, practices, alliances and narratives regarding civic participation and human rights.

E. Sustainability: to assess the likelihood that the benefits, capacities, structures and processes developed by the project will continue beyond the project period.

The evaluations shall assess:

- organisational sustainability of supported CSOs/CBOs and networks;
- institutional sustainability of partnerships, coalitions and advocacy processes;
- sustainability of knowledge, tools and methodologies developed by the project;
- sustainability of digital platforms and resource centres;
- ownership and continuation of protection and monitoring mechanisms;
- sustainability of engagement with UN and international human rights systems;
- financial sustainability and resource mobilisation capacities of participating organisations;
- policy and institutional changes promoted by the project.

The evaluations shall also examine risks that may threaten sustainability, including:

- restrictive legal frameworks;
- shrinking civic spaces;
- security threats and reprisals against activists;
- dependency on external funding;
- organisational fragility and staff turnover;
- digital security risks and technological limitations.

The evaluators shall analyse whether the project has successfully embedded sustainability strategies into its capacity building, advocacy, networking and organisational development approaches.

F. Learning, Innovation and Knowledge Generation: to identify lessons learned, innovative approaches, good practices and strategic recommendations for future programming related to:

- youth civic participation;
- protection of civic space;
- rights-based and intersectional approaches;
- participatory sub-granting mechanisms;
- digital learning methodologies;
- movement-building and coalition strengthening;
- advocacy and engagement with international human rights mechanisms.

The evaluations should examine the extent to which the project contributed to:

- peer-to-peer learning;
- decolonial and transformative approaches to activism;
- exchange of experiences across regions;
- production and dissemination of knowledge products and communication tools;
- visibility of local and grassroots activism globally.

The evaluators shall provide actionable recommendations for:

- future phases of the project;
- replication or scaling-up of approaches;
- strengthening consortium coordination;
- improving monitoring, evaluation and learning systems (including practical suggestions for improving the measurement of project indicators);
- increasing accessibility, inclusion and protection of participants.

The table below provides definitions for each standard Criterion and possible related evaluation questions.

OECD/DAC Criteria	Possible evaluation questions related to OECD criteria
Relevance: Alignment of the project with contextual realities, needs of rightsholders and strategic priorities. The extent to which the programme objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.	Are the programme's objectives still aligned with the needs and priorities of youth-led and youth-focused civil society actors? To what extent do the project objectives and strategies respond to the realities faced by youth-led and youth-focused civil society actors in restrictive civic environments? How relevant are the project approaches for supporting freedoms of association and peaceful assembly in the target countries, and to what extent do they respond to/interacts with national policies? Is the project close enough to the target groups to understand their situation, as well as eventual changes in their needs and the need to adjust the programme (proximity)? How relevant and accessible are the project's capacity-building and protection mechanisms for participating organisations? Were appropriate and timely adaptations made in response to changes in the context? Does the programme strategy remain appropriate to achieve the intended objectives?
Coherence: Internal and external consistency and complementarity of the intervention. The compatibility of the programme with other initiatives in the context.	Is the programme implementation coherent with Project's Theory of Change and rights-based approach? Does the programme respond to one or more Indicators the Project's Logical Framework? How coherent are the three strategic pillars of the project with one another? To what extent do the activities reinforce each other across outputs and regions? How effectively does the project complement other human rights, democracy and civic participation initiatives? How well does the programme complement and coordinate with other initiatives in the same context?

	Are there effective mechanisms to avoid duplication of efforts and promote collaboration with partners and other actors? Are coordination and collaboration mechanisms among consortium members effective? To what extent does the programme create synergies with other initiatives of the consortium partners? To what extent does the project contribute to strengthening local-to-global connections and advocacy spaces?
Effectiveness: The extent to which the programme achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.	To what extent have planned outputs and outcomes been achieved, and were they delivered on time? How effective has the capacity-building programme been in strengthening organisational and advocacy capacities? To what extent have the FSTP mechanisms enabled meaningful civic participation and organisational strengthening? How effective have the protection and security measures been in reducing risks for activists? To what extent have monitoring and documentation systems contributed to visibility and advocacy on civic freedoms? How effective has the project been in engaging youth and marginalised groups? To what extent have communication and visibility activities contributed to mobilisation and awareness raising? What key factors have contributed to or hindered the achievement of results? What are the limitations/opportunities inherent in the approach? What can be done to make the programme more effective?
Efficiency: The extent to which the programmes delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way: Measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs.	How cost-effective is the programme in terms of the qualitative and quantitative outputs achieved as a result of the inputs? How efficiently have resources (financial, human, logistical) been used to deliver results? How does the programme compare ‘cost per beneficiary’ to other similar programs? How effective are communication and information-sharing systems within the consortium? Are programme structures, processes, and staffing arrangements efficient? How does it compare to other similar programs? How efficient are the online learning and multilingual delivery systems? Are monitoring, reporting and decision-making systems adequate and timely? How efficient are the procurement and sub-granting processes? What changes could improve efficiency in future phases?
Impact: The extent to which the programme has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects. The wider effect of the	What significant changes (intended or unintended) has the project contributed to at individual, organisational and network levels? How do rightsholders and stakeholders perceive the programme’s effects on their lives?

project on individuals, gender and age-groups, communities and institutions.	Does the programme make a difference? Can a contribution to changes in behaviour be attributed to the programme? To what extent has the project strengthened youth participation and leadership in civic spaces? How has the project contributed to protection and visibility of freedoms of association and peaceful assembly? What changes have occurred in the capacities and resilience of participating organisations? Has the project contributed to stronger alliances, coalitions and movement-building processes? What unintended positive or negative effects emerged from the intervention? To what extent have project methodologies and knowledge products generated broader influence beyond direct beneficiaries?
Sustainability: The extent to which the net benefits of the programme continue or are likely to continue, degree of ownership by stakeholders and resilience to risks.	Are the programme's benefits likely to continue after external support or funding ends? Which results are most likely to be maintained by local actors, and which are at risk of fading? To what extent are advocacy processes, coalitions and networks likely to continue beyond the project period? Are the digital platforms, methodologies and knowledge products sustainable and replicable? Have participating organisations strengthened their resource mobilisation and institutional capacities? To what extent has ownership been transferred to local actors and youth-led organisations? What risks (political, financial, environmental, or social) could threaten the long-term sustainability of results? What risk mitigation or adaptation strategies have been built into the programme? How flexible and resilient are programme outcomes to changing contexts (e.g., policy shifts, economic downturns)?

Cross-Cutting Issues	- How does the programme apply a Human Rights-based Approach? - How does the programme promote gender equality and equity? - How does the programme promote environmental and climate justice? - How does the programme apply conflict sensitivity and transformation? - How does the programme pursue do-no-harm? - How effectively has the project promoted meaningful participation of women and marginalised youth? - To what extent has the project applied intersectional and transformative approaches? - How accessible and safe were the project methodologies and participation mechanisms? - To what extent did the project strengthen protection, inclusion and agency of vulnerable groups?
-----------------------------	--

ASSESSMENT BENCHMARKS (SUB-CRITERIA): While the OECD/DAC criteria are fixed, specific assessment benchmarks or sub-criteria (e.g., indicators of efficiency or relevance) are to be developed during the inception phase of the evaluation, by the evaluators. These sub-criteria will be based on the evaluation questions and the programme's context.

5. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

5.1 Evaluation Approach

The evaluation shall adopt a participatory, utilisation-focused and human rights-based, ensuring that the evaluation process is not only accountable and rigorous, but also useful for learning, adaptive management and future programming.

The evaluators are expected to apply methodologies that are:

- participatory and inclusive;
- gender-sensitive and intersectional;
- context-sensitive and conflict-aware;
- ethically sound and protective of participants;
- appropriate for restrictive civic environments;
- adapted to multilingual and multicultural implementation contexts.

The consortium recommends that evaluations that aim at assessing impact adopt Theory-Based Approaches (Contribution Analysis, Theory of Change analysis) or Outcome-Oriented Approaches (Outcome Harvesting, Outcome Mapping IF previously integrated in the planning of the programme), as these approaches are best suited to capture the complexity of our work and provide credible assessments of contribution rather than relying on linear, indicator-heavy methods.

The evaluation must ensure triangulation of data by drawing on multiple sources, perspectives, and methods to cross-check and validate findings. Where appropriate, the evaluation may employ a mixed-methods strategy, integrating qualitative and quantitative data collection to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the programme's results and context.

The methodology shall be designed to assess both:

- the quality and effectiveness of implementation processes;
- the extent to which the project contributes to changes at individual, organisational, network and ecosystem levels.

The evaluators are encouraged to apply adaptive and innovative methodologies suitable for civic space, human rights and movement-building programmes, including approaches capable of capturing non-linear, transformational and emergent changes.

The evaluation approach shall be guided by the following principles:

Human Rights-Based and Participatory Approach

The evaluation shall ensure meaningful participation of stakeholders throughout the process, recognising participants as rights-holders and agents of change. Particular attention shall be paid to the inclusion of youth-led organisations, grassroots groups and marginalised communities, including women, LGBTQIA+ persons, indigenous peoples, Afro-descendants, ethnic and religious minorities and persons with disabilities.

Gender-Transformative and Intersectional Approach

The evaluation shall assess how the project integrated gender equality, inclusion and intersectionality across implementation. Data collection and analysis should consider differentiated experiences, barriers and impacts among target groups. The evaluations must include a gender analysis that assesses how the programme affects women, men, girls, boys, and people with non-hegemonic gender identities. Findings must be disaggregated by gender and other relevant factors (age, disability, etc.) where possible. The

evaluation team must apply ForumCiv's Gender Equality and Equity Policy and ensure that recommendations promote gender-responsive and inclusive programming.

Learning and Adaptive Approach

The evaluation shall place strong emphasis on organisational learning, identification of good practices, lessons learned and actionable recommendations. The methodology should support reflection on innovative approaches related to civic participation, movement-building, protection and advocacy in restrictive contexts.

Context-Sensitive and Protection-Oriented Approach

Given the sensitive civic and political environments where the project operates, the evaluation shall apply conflict-sensitive and "do no harm" principles. The evaluators must ensure confidentiality, informed consent and protection of participants, particularly human rights defenders and activists at risk.

Mixed-Methods and Evidence-Based Approach

The evaluation shall combine desk review, interviews, focus groups, surveys, case studies and participatory reflection methods. Findings should be evidence-based and supported through triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data.

Utilisation-Focused Approach

The evaluation shall generate practical findings and recommendations that can support:

- adaptive management during implementation;
- strategic learning within the consortium;
- accountability toward stakeholders and the donor (including the use of evaluator-proposed measurements or metrics that strengthen the monitoring and tracking of project indicators);
- future programming and replication of good practices.

5.2 Sampling Strategy

The evaluators shall propose a sampling strategy that ensures:

- representation across all target regions;
- inclusion of different categories of stakeholders;
- diversity of target groups and identities;
- balance between organisational types and levels;
- consideration of varying implementation contexts.

The sample should include representation from:

- national, regional and global networks;
- youth-led organisations;
- informal and grassroots groups;
- FSTP recipients;
- participants in capacity-building activities;
- project staff from all consortium partners and all levels of management (country, regional, global) and units (MEL, Communications, Finance & Admin, Capacity Building).

The methodology should explain:

- rationale for sample selection;

- limitations related to accessibility or security;
- strategies to mitigate selection bias.

5.3 Data Analysis

The evaluators shall analyse evidence according to:

- the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria;
- project logical framework and indicators;
- cross-cutting themes and protection considerations;
- intended and unintended outcomes.

The analysis should:

- triangulate qualitative and quantitative findings;
- identify patterns and divergences across contexts;
- distinguish between outputs, outcomes and broader contributions;
- assess both tangible and intangible changes.

Special attention should be paid to:

- transformational and relational changes;
- empowerment and agency;
- movement-building and coalition strengthening;
- institutional and policy influence;
- resilience and protection capacities.
- the validity and achievement of the project's intervention logic

5.4 Ethical Considerations and Safeguarding

The evaluation shall comply with international ethical standards for research and evaluation in human rights and civic space contexts.

The evaluators must ensure:

- informed consent;
- confidentiality and anonymity;
- secure handling and storage of data;
- safeguarding of participants;
- protection-sensitive communications;
- compliance with GDPR and relevant data protection standards.

Special precautions must be adopted when engaging:

- human rights defenders;
- activists operating in restrictive contexts;
- vulnerable or at-risk participants.

The evaluators shall clearly explain:

- risk mitigation measures;
- data protection protocols;
- consent procedures;
- safeguarding and referral mechanisms, where relevant.

5.5 Quality Assurance

The evaluators shall ensure methodological rigour through:

- triangulation of data sources;
- transparent analytical frameworks;
- systematic documentation of evidence;
- validation of findings;
- quality control procedures for data collection and analysis.

The evaluation reports should:

- clearly distinguish evidence from interpretation;
- explain methodological limitations;
- justify conclusions and recommendations with evidence;
- provide practical and realistic recommendations.

5.6 Deliverables Related to Methodology

As part of the inception phase, the evaluators shall submit an Inception Report detailing:

- refined evaluation matrix;
- evaluation questions;
- methodological framework;
- data collection tools;
- sampling strategy;
- workplan and timeline;
- ethical and safeguarding protocols;
- limitations and mitigation strategies.

The inception report shall be approved by the global coordination team before the start of data collection activities.

USE OF AI ASSISTANCE

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to support specific tasks within the evaluation process is permitted, provided that such use is explicitly described in the methodology section of the inception report. The evaluator must specify the AI platform(s) used, the stages at which AI is applied, and the specific purposes (e.g., transcription, summarization, language review). All use of AI must comply with GDPR and ForumCiv's data protection standards. Lack of transparency regarding AI use may be considered a breach of contract.

6. RESULTS NARRATIVES

In addition to analysing programme performance under the OECD/DAC criteria, the evaluation team is expected to produce a set of **results narratives as an annex to the final report**. These narratives will document and communicate key programme results in a clear, story-driven manner that aligns with ForumCiv's results reporting system.

What Are Results Narratives?

Results Narratives refer to a reporting format that ForumCiv uses to define and communicate its impact. The format is story-like, inspired by outcome harvesting and Most Significant Change, while also allowing for reporting of quantitative and statistical conclusions.

Well carried out evaluations should be able to easily produce results narratives because all the components of a result narrative had been identified and verified to answer to the evaluation questions. The additional exercise consists in formulating the information under a specific format.

Results narratives focus on outcome level (changes in behaviours and relationships) or impact level (changes in conditions) and aim at explaining the change observed, the context in which it occurred, and OROF's contribution to that change.

The presence of each component of a Results Narrative allows for an evidence-based results documentation.

Key components of a Results Narrative:

Optional: start with a brief overview of the context

Provide:

- the geographical area concerned
- the right-holders concerned by and with the change (population)
- the period of the intervention leading to the outcome (roughly: months, # years, a decade?)
- the type of the Consortium's contribution (program/output).
- the division of roles if there are collaborations (consortium, co-implementation, sub-granting?)
- the change in behaviour according to the focus of the analysis (often a verb)
- possible additional outcomes and impact
- a reflection on the relevance of the outcomes via an analysis of significance to the context, comparisons, quotes, conclusions from the evaluation, etc.

Suggested Process:

During the evaluations, the team will identify results (expected and unexpected) by utilizing the chosen approach and methods.

The evaluation team will then craft narratives under the required format to present the analytical findings and deliver it as an annex to the Final report.

7. DELIVERABLES

Deliverable 1: Inception Report for mid-term evaluation

A detailed document, **max 12 pages excluding annexes, using ForumCiv's inception report template**, to be produced after 2 weeks from the signature of contract, that presents:

- The proposed evaluation methodology and approach for mid-term evaluation.
- An evaluation matrix linking objectives, questions, and criteria to data sources, collection methods.
- An analysis of evaluation possible challenges, risks and mitigation measures
- The proposed data sources (documents to be reviewed, list of stakeholder to meet/interview, etc.)
- The evaluation travel and logistical arrangements.
- Ethical and data protection considerations.
- A timeline and work plan for the evaluation activities and deliverables.
- Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team.
- In annex: draft data collection tools (e.g., surveys interview guides, focus group protocols).

Debriefing Sessions/Workshops

Interactive sessions where evaluators share interim findings or progress updates with key stakeholders. These sessions serve to validate and verify data, test preliminary findings, assess the feasibility of recommendations, and strengthen transparency and ownership among stakeholders.

Deliverable 2: Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report

A comprehensive draft report submitted for review, allowing sufficient time for stakeholder feedback and iterative revisions.

The draft should address all agreed objectives and evaluation questions, and include clear, actionable recommendations.

Deliverable 3: Mid-Term Evaluation Report

The mid-term report should incorporate all agreed revisions, ensuring it is evidence-based, well-structured, and ready for external dissemination.

The mid-term report shall be based on the template provided as an annex to this TOR and include the following sections:

- Title Page
- List of Acronyms and abbreviations.
- Table of Contents.
- Executive Summary (key findings, conclusions, and recommendations in no more than 2 pages).
- Introduction and Background (context, programme overview, purpose of evaluation).
- Objectives, criteria and questions (linked to OECD/DAC criteria).
- Approach and methodology (including sampling, data collection methods, limitations, and triangulation).
- Findings (organized by criteria, with evidence-supported analysis).
- Conclusions (answer to evaluation questions).
- Recommendations (actionable, prioritized, and realistic).
- Annexes, including:
 - Terms of Reference (ToR)
 - List of documents reviewed
 - List of stakeholders consulted (interviews, focus groups)
 - Data collection tools (e.g., interview guides)
 - Evaluation matrix (if not included in the main body)
 - Other relevant annexes

Deliverable 4: Draft Final Evaluation Report

A comprehensive draft report submitted for review, allowing sufficient time for stakeholder feedback and iterative revisions.

The draft should address all agreed objectives and evaluation questions, and include clear, actionable recommendations.

Deliverable 5: Final Evaluation Report

The final report should incorporate all agreed revisions, ensuring it is evidence-based, well-structured, and ready for external dissemination.

The final report shall be based on the template provided as an annex to this TOR and include the following sections:

- Title Page
- List of Acronyms and abbreviations.
- Table of Contents.
- Executive Summary (key findings, conclusions, and recommendations in no more than 2 pages).
- Introduction and Background (context, programme overview, purpose of evaluation).
- Objectives, criteria and questions (linked to OECD/DAC criteria).
- Approach and methodology (including sampling, data collection methods, limitations, and triangulation).
- Findings (organized by criteria, with evidence-supported analysis).
- Conclusions (answer to evaluation questions).
- Recommendations (actionable, prioritized, and realistic).
- Annexes, including:
 - Results narratives (see Deliverable 6)
 - Terms of Reference (ToR)
 - List of documents reviewed
 - List of stakeholders consulted (interviews, focus groups)
 - Data collection tools (e.g., interview guides)
 - Evaluation matrix (if not included in the main body)
 - Dissemination outputs (see Deliverable 7)
 - Other relevant annexes

Deliverable 6: Results narratives annex, as per section 7.

As part of the Final Report, the evaluators will compile **3–5 results narratives (or more if possible)** as an annex to the final report.

Each narrative should be between half a page to 1,5 pages, written in a concise and accessible style, and include evidence (e.g., quotes, statistics, examples).

Narratives must be validated with key stakeholders (partners, rightsholders) to ensure accuracy and transparency.

Deliverable 7: Dissemination Outputs

Materials designed to communicate key findings and lessons learned, which may include:

- Executive summaries, infographics, or summary posters.
- Internal presentations or learning sessions with ForumCiv teams and partners.

- Contributions to external conferences, workshops, or publications (as agreed with ForumCiv).

In all the public events and in the final outputs, the visibility of the European Union shall be guaranteed in compliance with the latest Communication and Visibility Manual for EU External Actions concerning acknowledgement of EU financing of the project.

Management Response Plan (ForumCiv Responsibility)

Following the completion of the final report, ForumCiv will prepare a Management Response Plan. This plan will outline how ForumCiv will respond to the evaluation's recommendations, specifying actions to be taken, responsibilities, and timelines for follow-up. This step ensures that the evaluation findings directly inform programme improvement and organizational learning.

8. PROPOSED TIMELINE

This section summarises the timing of key evaluation events/ deliverables and deadlines. The timeline can be revised and detailed during the inception phase:

Deliverable	Deadline/submission date
Inception report	August-Sept 2026
Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report	Sept-Oct 2026
Mid-Term Evaluation Report	Oct-Nov 2026
Results Narratives annex	Oct-Nov 2026
Final mid-term evaluation Report	December 2026
Draft Final Evaluation Report	Dec 2027
Final Evaluation Report	Jan 2028 *
Results Narratives annex	Jan 2028 *
Dissemination Outputs	Feb 2028 *

* The EU allows ex-post evaluations funded by the project, thus enables their closure after the implementation period.

9. APPLICATION PROCESS

9.1 Profile

The consultancy team must demonstrate:

- Advanced university degree in social sciences, human rights, political science, international development, evaluation or related fields;
- Minimum 7 years of experience in programme evaluation;
- Proven expertise in human rights, civic space, democracy and civil society strengthening;
- Experience evaluating EU-funded projects;
- Strong knowledge of OECD/DAC evaluation criteria;
- Experience with participatory and gender-sensitive methodologies;
- Experience working in restrictive or fragile contexts;
- Excellent analytical and report-writing skills in English. Fluency in similar skills in Spanish, Portuguese and French will be highly appreciated.

Additional desired aspects:

- Experience with youth-led movements and intersectional approaches;
- Knowledge of digital security/protection approaches;
- Experience in multiple target regions.

9.2 Required Documents

Interested consultants/teams are invited to submit:

1. Technical proposal including:
 - understanding of the assignment;
 - methodology;
 - workplan;
 - team composition.
2. Financial proposal (see Section 10) indicating the amount of the proposal for both but separately, mid-term and final evaluation process.
3. CV(s) of consultant(s) and/or portfolio.
4. Examples of previous relevant evaluations.
5. Contact details of at least two references.

Note: *All application documents must be submitted in English. Supporting documents originally produced in another language may be submitted in their original language, but ForumCiv reserves the right to request an English translation if needed for the assessment.*

9.3 Selection Criteria

Applications will be assessed based on:

Criterion	Maximum Score
Technical quality and methodology;	25
Relevant evaluation experience, including EU funded projects;	20
Expertise, composition and language capacities of proposed team;	20
Understanding of civic space and human rights contexts;	20
Financial competitiveness.	15

The maximum available budget for the Mid-Term Evaluation is EUR 30.000, including all applicable taxes, fees, travel, accommodation, data collection and related costs. The indicative maximum budget for the possible Final Evaluation is EUR 30,000. The financial proposal must present both amounts separately.

After the initial assessment of the submitted documentation, the selection committee will proceed to evaluate the proposals according to selection criteria. The highest-ranked technically compliant proposals may be invited to an interview.

The interview will be used to clarify and further assess the applicant's understanding of the assignment, proposed methodology, team composition, availability, risk management approach, ethical and safeguarding considerations, and financial proposal. The interview will not follow a pre-disclosed question guide.

The interview will be scored on a maximum of 100 points. The final score for shortlisted applicants will be calculated as the average between the initial evaluation score and the interview score, as follows:

$$\text{Final score} = (\text{Initial evaluation score} + \text{Interview score}) / 2$$

The selection committee will document the interview score and the basis for the final recommendation. The final selection will be made based on the combined assessment of the submitted proposal and the interview...

9.4 Submission of applications and questions

The required documents must be sent to **info.lac@forumciv.org** with the subject line “**OROF Mid-Term and Final Evaluation**”.

Only applications sent to this email address **by 11.59 pm (Colombian time) on 9 September 2026** will be considered.

Any questions regarding these Terms of Reference must be submitted to **info.lac@forumciv.org** by 2 September **at 11:59 pm Colombian time**.

ForumCiv will contact shortlisted applicants directly if an interview or additional clarification is required as part of the selection process.

10. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL AND TERMS OF PAYMENT

The applicant shall submit a detailed financial proposal outlining all expected costs for conducting the evaluation. The proposal should include a clear budget breakdown (e.g., professional fees, travel and accommodation costs, per diems, data collection expenses, and other direct costs), as well as any applicable taxes. Costs must be reasonable, transparent, and reflect value for money while ensuring high-quality outputs. ForumCiv reserves the right to request clarifications or adjustments if the proposed budget appears inconsistent with the scope of work or proposed methodology.

Payment will be made in instalments tied to key deliverables per evaluation (mid-term and final), for example 20% upon approval of the inception report, 40% upon submission of each draft-evaluation report and 40% upon acceptance of the approved mid-term and final evaluation report. The final payment will be made only after all deliverables have been satisfactorily completed and approved by ForumCiv.

Contract will be signed initially for the process regarding mid-term report. Subject to the satisfactory performance of the contractor, the acceptance of the deliverables related to the mid-term evaluation and the confirmation of the continued need for the services, the Contracting Authority may consider requesting the same contractor to undertake the final evaluation of the OROF project.

Any continuation of the services for the final evaluation, with an indicative maximum value of **EUR 30,000**, shall be subject to the applicable procurement rules and contractual conditions. Where permitted, such continuation may be formalised through an amendment/addendum to the initial contract. The Contracting Authority shall not be obliged to request or award the additional services.

The final evaluation shall be based on the same overall methodology and technical requirements established in these Terms of Reference, as applicable, and the final scope, timing and deliverables shall be confirmed before the additional services are authorised.

11. ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMITMENT

The evaluation team must adhere to ForumCiv's Anti-Corruption Policy and declare any potential conflicts of interest before the evaluation begins. Any form of bribery, favouritism, or unethical conduct is strictly prohibited. Suspected cases of corruption or irregularities identified during the evaluation must be reported to ForumCiv immediately.

12. DATA PROTECTION AND GDPR COMPLIANCE

The evaluation team must ensure that all personal data collected during the evaluation is processed in accordance with the European Union General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and ForumCiv's Privacy Policy. This includes secure storage, restricted access to personal data, anonymisation where possible, and using personal data solely for the purposes of this evaluation. All participants must be informed of how their data will be used, and consent must be obtained where required.

13. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND DO-NO-HARM

The evaluation must apply a do-no-harm approach and respect the dignity, rights, and safety of all participants. Special care must be taken when engaging with vulnerable groups to avoid causing harm or reinforcing inequalities. Evaluators are expected to ensure impartiality, confidentiality, and cultural sensitivity throughout the evaluation process.

ForumCiv is committed to equal treatment, non-discrimination, gender equality and transparency in all procurement processes. The selection and contracting process will be conducted in accordance with ForumCiv's applicable internal procedures, anti-corruption policy and the relevant rules of the European Union.

These Terms of Reference will be financed under budget line 5.4 Evaluation costs, Cost Centre 57986540, within the framework of the OROF project.

Terms of Reference approved by:



Carlos Cárdenas Angel
Director Regional ROLAC
ForumCiv

Verificación

ID del documento 09222115557586615207

Documento

20260819_ Terms of Reference_Evaluation_OROF
Documento principal
23 páginas
Comenzado el 2026-08-19 22:05:39 CEST (+0200) por
Anyela Téllez Cañón (ATC)
Finalizado a las 2026-08-19 22:13:37 CEST (+0200)

Firmantes

Anyela Téllez Cañón (ATC)
ForumCiv
Nº reg. de empresa 802400-7620
anyela.tellez@forumciv.org
+573204140776
Firmado 2026-08-19 22:05:39 CEST (+0200)

Carlos Cardenas (CC)
carlos.cardenas@forumciv.org
+573142105869

Firmado 2026-08-19 22:13:37 CEST (+0200)

Esta verificación fue emitida por Scrive. Para obtener más información/datos sobre este documento, consulte los archivos adjuntos ocultos. Utilice un lector de PDF como Adobe Reader que pueda mostrar archivos adjuntos ocultos. Tenga en cuenta que, si se imprime el documento, la integridad de dicha copia impresa no se puede verificar y que una impresión básica carece del contenido de los archivos adjuntos ocultos. La firma digital (sello electrónico) garantiza que la integridad de este documento, incluidos los archivos adjuntos ocultos, pueda demostrarse matemáticamente e independientemente de Scrive. Para su comodidad, Scrive también proporciona un servicio que le permite verificar automáticamente la integridad del documento en: <https://scrive.com/verify>

